

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/729,959		TACHIZAWA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Lakshmi S. Channavajjala		1615	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Lakshmi S. Channavajjala. (3) Mr. Niinaka.  
 (2) Richard Chinn. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 14 December 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Identification of prior art discussed: on record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed the teachings of US 6133212 for the teachings of distribution of ethoxylation in the alkyl sulfates. Attorney explained that the reference does not teach the speed of foaming and also fails to teach the claimed distribution of  $n=0-2$  is 70% or greater. Discussed the teachings of EP 190010 with respect to the degree of ethoxylation. Attorney explained the unexpected results of the instant specification (tables 1 and 2) where the lower than 70% distribution gives a lower foam speed. Examiner suggested to incorporate all of the arguments and examiner will consider the responses in determining the patentability of the claims.